

In the District of Columbia today, interstate highway construction has been stopped until mass transportation studies are completed. You know how long these studies take. How much redtape is involved. The cities are now being strangled by traffic bottlenecks. With the movement of population to urban centers, if highway construction is stopped until these mass transit systems are developed, you are going to have chaos in our cities.

Think of the tremendous economic loss, in accidents, in time loss, in vehicle operating costs, while we attempt to get agreement on the type, location, and financing of a new mass transit system. With the tremendous increase in urban population, you are going to need not only presently planned highways but additional highways, as well as mass transit systems.

It took us years of fighting to get highway taxes put aside for road construction. These user taxes are being held in trust (for those who pay them) to be spent on highways. It would be morally wrong now to divert them to build other transportation systems. Let the users of those systems pay for them.

The congressional highway investigating committee, as I have said, is pointing its finger at State highway officials, contractors, consulting engineers, realtors, lawyers, etc., who are not toeing the line. The question is, will this committee have the courage to unmask wrongdoing and political chicanery at the Federal level?

In my remarks to the American Association of State Highway Officials at Denver last October, I said:

"Although I cannot prove it at this time, I am reliably informed that the White House is ready to add some 150 miles to the Interstate System in West Virginia. Of all places where this valuable mileage is not needed and not justified is the State of West Virginia."

Lo and behold, in less than a week after the October American Association of State Highway Officials meeting, this mileage by order of the White House, was given to West Virginia.

I then immediately addressed a memorandum to the chairman of the investigating committee. This memorandum tells the full story. Here it is:

"The Department of Commerce, after consultation with the White House, has

allocated 180 miles for a new interstate highway between Washington, Pa., and Charleston, W. Va. This 180 miles has been taken from the remaining 285 unallocated miles of the Interstate System.

"As we all know, these 285 miles have been held in reserve for vitally needed final mileage adjustments required to complete the Interstate System. This mileage, like money in the bank, was to be used to connect segments of the Interstate System and to provide bypasses around population centers where traffic density is great and accident rates high. Almost every State in the Union has made a request for an allocation of some mileage from this road-bank to relieve critical traffic needs. The Bureau of Public Roads has consistently turned down all applications because this 285 mile reserve is needed for final adjustments.

My memorandum continued:

"As an example, Texas asked for a 6-mile addition to an interstate route to close a gap over the Houston ship canal. This 6 miles will carry about 96,000 vehicles a day by 1975. The only presently approved route will have to carry more than 200,000 vehicles a day. This application for 6 miles was rejected. Yet, it is admitted that the new West Virginia route in 1975 will not carry in excess of 5,000 vehicles a day and possibly less.

"Knoxville, Tenn., requested a 10-mile segment to take heavy through traffic around the city. It was denied. There are dozens of other examples.

"There is already under construction a designated interstate route between Charleston, W. Va., and Washington, Pa., which is only about 7 miles longer than the new interstate route between these two cities, to be built over costly mountainous terrain. Talk about waste. Some which the committee is now looking at is peanuts compared to this.

"If an improved road is needed between Washington, Pa., and Charleston, W. Va., the existing Federal aid primary highway could be improved or rebuilt and no one would be hurt.

"If this were done, West Virginia, of course, would have to pay 50 percent of the cost. As you know, West Virginia will only be required to contribute 10 percent of the cost of this new interstate highway. It's obvious that the Kennedy administration wants to pay 90 percent of an expensive superhighway that is not needed as a reward for what

the West Virginia politicians did in the presidential primary.

"If the administration wants to help West Virginia, it shouldn't loot this precious reserve of vitally needed mileage and engage in an unconscionable waste of money on a superhighway that's not needed. In fact, of all the places where this valuable mileage is not needed is in the State of West Virginia, especially when compared to the critical requirements of the other States.

"This unwarranted allocation violates one of the basic concepts of the new highway program. In this program we abandon the old pork barrel formula of dispensing highway funds. We sold it to the people of this country on the promise that we would build these expensive highways where the traffic was and not necessarily where the votes were. By this blatant, callous, political maneuver we have destroyed this fundamental principle of the 1956 act.

"The dedicated experts in the Bureau of Public Roads, whose job it is to build adequate highways where needed, vigorously opposed the allocation of this valuable mileage to West Virginia. The politically inspired and often inept in the Department of Commerce steamrollered the Bureau of Public Roads. In fact, I am reliably informed that the Department of Commerce is letting political considerations control many decisions on highway locations, etc."

My memorandum concluded:

"Our highway investigating committee should make its first order of business when it returns in January to condemn this misuse and abuse of power by the Department of Commerce, and attempt to find a means to reverse this action of the administration.

"If we don't face up to this challenge, I don't see how our investigating committee can in fairness and in all good conscience continue to point its finger at shortcomings of State highway departments contractors, engineers, and others throughout the country—shortcomings and derelictions which have a far less adverse and costly effect on the highway construction program than this recent action of the Department of Commerce."

This memorandum was sent October 30, 1961. It is now March 5, 1962, and to date I have not so much as received an acknowledgment of same.

We got this highway program. Let's keep it and not throw it away by permitting some of the things I have mentioned here today.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Max M. Landman, Temple Beth El, West Palm Beach, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Creator and destiny of all flesh, from the depth of my heart I thank Thee, and bless Thee for this spiritual honor accorded me, to stand in this citadel of justice, to invoke Thy blessing upon this healthy, strong, intelligent body called the House of Representatives.

This body makes up an impregnable fortress from where comes justice, faith, liberty, equality to the highest degree. Through Thy grace, O Lord, we have men and women who, like the prophets of old, lead the people on the right path.

May the hearts, minds, and souls of these leaders always remain healthy, normal, and like a strong chain, never

to be broken, so that they may think, feel, and act justly and harmoniously for the benefit of all citizens of our blessed country, America, and for all men in Thy beautiful universe.

Bless the President of our great Republic, the Vice President, and members of the Cabinet. Bless the Speaker of this assembly, and also the Members of the Senate and the Justices of the Supreme Court. Give them wisdom equal to their physical strength, and courage equal to their responsibilities, so that they, too, will close their link of leadership in this great insoluble chain of liberty, justice, and freedom.

United we shall never permit our enemies from without and from within to destroy our faith and our democratic way of life. May Thy divine light flood the world with true brotherhood, and the sound of the Liberty Bell echo to the four corners of the earth, calling all men to walk side by side to the mountain of the Lord, and there build the temple of love, of faith, and of true peace.

Blessed be Thy name from this time forth and forevermore. And let us say, "Amen."

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 8, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1023. An act to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House, with an amendment, to the bill

(S. 1969) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. MORTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the reports of the Archivist of the United States numbered 62-14.

MANPOWER TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1991) relating to manpower requirements, resources, development, and utilization, and for other purposes.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT

Mr. HOLLAND (at the request of Mr. POWELL) submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 8723) Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Friday, March 16, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 10650).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

RESERVISTS DESERVE ADDITIONAL PAY

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for an additional \$100 per month for enlisted reservists called to active duty during the Berlin crisis. This extra \$100 per month will be retroactive from the date of recall of each reservist.

The passage of this bill is necessary to help alleviate the many hardships of the 150,000 reservists recalled to active duty. A large majority of the personnel recalled have previously served 2 or more years in the Armed Forces. They have been trying to get established in

civilian life. Many of them have gone in debt to pay for automobiles, furniture, homes, and in many cases, to establish small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, this involves financial losses which cannot be recovered. The average reservist is enduring personal hardships suffered by his family, separation of families, and loss of job opportunities and promotions. Regular Army personnel know that they may be moved at any time. Therefore, they do not become permanently settled in any one location like a reservist. They also know what their income will be from month to month and live accordingly. Many reservists that were recalled had to adjust from monthly incomes of \$400 to \$1,000 to only \$155 to \$250. This resulted in their families moving in with relatives or to lower priced rentals. Those who had small businesses had to close them up since it was difficult to secure a qualified manager with only a 15-day notice. Doctors in the Regular Army are granted extra pay each month to compensate for their expensive education and loss of pay from private practice.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is fair; it is just and timely. This bill will create a feeling among reservists that the Government recognizes their hardships. It will help promote higher morale among the reservists and above all, it is an obligation we owe these men for preserving the peace.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CUBAN TOBACCO STILL FINDING ITS WAY INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, Cuban tobacco is still finding its way into the United States.

The Foreign Assets Control Division of the Treasury Department has ruled that cigars made of Cuban tobacco may be imported into the United States if made in a foreign country other than Cuba and Cuban leaf may be imported if "substantially transformed" in such foreign country.

Unless such a ruling is reversed and the embargo made total the desired effect of the President's proclamation will be nullified, the embargo in its present form will permit back-door transactions with Cuba contrary to the spirit and intent of the embargo and Castro will

continue to obtain U.S. dollars to finance his unholy operations.

Moreover, this ruling is an open invitation to unscrupulous speculators to profit at the expense of the American consumer, the U.S. cigar industry and its employees.

I am today urging the President to take the necessary steps to prohibit the importation of Cuban tobacco products in whole or part irrespective of where they are manufactured or transformed and to make his embargo total.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1936, President Roosevelt signed into law the bill that was popularly known as the Norris-Rayburn bill, thus creating the Rural Electrification Administration.

Our late Speaker, friend, and colleague, Mr. Sam, loved the REA and greatly valued the benefits it brought to the American farmer and our farm communities. The REA has enabled our farm families to share on a more equal basis the fruits of our democracy.

I need not tell you that the REA battle was not over when President Roosevelt signed the Norris-Rayburn bill. Each year the Congress is asked to vote on matters materially affecting the rural electric program.

A few days ago it was my pleasure to read a letter from Mr. Clyde T. Ellis, who is general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, concerning the actions in behalf of the REA by one of my colleagues from Oklahoma, Congressman VICTOR WICKERSHAM.

I should like to read to the House of Representatives Mr. Ellis' letter because I feel that the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman WICKERSHAM, can be proud of his record, and this letter illustrates the feeling we in Oklahoma have for the program begun so many years ago by Speaker Rayburn.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1962.

Hon. VICTOR WICKERSHAM,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR VICTOR: This will confirm my wire to you today regarding your voting record in the House of Representatives on rural electrification and related issues.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows that you have voted on 25 rural electrification and related issues during the time you have been in the House. The RECORD also shows that you voted favorably to the rural electric position on all 25 issues.

I congratulate you on your 100-percent support of the rural electrification program reflected by your voting record and by your efforts in behalf of rural electrification on other issues for which there is no recorded vote.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

AMENDING FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendment to the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

INDIAN FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today I believe will solve a situation which, at least in my district, has grown almost intolerable.

This situation has to do with Indians, either treaty or nontreaty, fishing off the reservation in violation of State regulations.

There are many cases on this subject and I have personally reviewed all those believed to be pertinent. I have also had the Library of Congress make a report on the subject, as well as receiving opinions from various lawyers and the attorney general of the State of Washington. These opinions vary from one extreme to the other—with the attorney general stating that the State has no right to regulate despite the opinion rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Tullee* against Washington and more recently, in the case of the *Village of Kahe et al.* against Egan.

Since the State enforcement agencies refuse to enforce what I believe to be the law and since these same agencies have appealed to the Congress to solve this problem, I have introduced the resolution today. I trust that the Department of the Interior will expedite its report on this measure so that hearings may be scheduled in this session.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUTHORIZE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO SELL PROPERTY IN PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY, VA.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 9699) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other pur-

poses and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no desire to object to the consideration of the bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole, but I want to say to the gentleman that, unless there is assurance that there will be ample time to ask questions and discuss the bill, I will object. I do not intend to forfeit general debate on a bill of this kind without the assurance that there will be no effort to unduly restrict debate.

Mr. McMILLAN. As far as I am concerned, you can have as much time as you desire by striking out the last word.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and empowered in their discretion, to sell and convey, in whole or in part, under the provisions of a contract to be negotiated by them, real estate now owned in fee simple by the District of Columbia consisting of approximately four hundred and fifty-five acres of land located in Prince William County, Virginia, and described in a deed conveying said land to the District of Columbia recorded on June 17, 1927, in liber 83, as folios 311 and 312, in the clerk's office of the circuit court of Prince William County, Commonwealth of Virginia.

SEC. 2. The said Commissioners are further authorized to pay the reasonable and necessary expenses of sale of each parcel of land sold pursuant to the provisions of this Act. They shall deposit the net proceeds of the sale in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "under the provisions of a contract to be negotiated by them" and insert "for its reasonable market value".

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the Commissioners sent to the Speaker a request for this legislation. It seems that several years ago the District of Columbia purchased this property in Virginia for a location for a garbage disposal. At the present time it is not required for that purpose. Now, Prince William County, Va., would like to purchase this property with certain restrictions. The Commissioners, of course, will see that the present market price is paid for this property, and that is why this proposed legislation is necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill would permit the District of Columbia to sell 455 acres of land in Prince William County, Va., the land having been obtained in part in 1918, and another parcel in 1927.

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding the District of Columbia paid for this land approximately \$75,000. My further understanding is, according to the report, that the District of Columbia would now get only \$85,000, this being the so-called fair market value of the land.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. That seems to be the agreement between the District officials and the Virginia officials. I do not know if that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the question I want to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is this: Has this 455 acres of land in Virginia enhanced only \$15 an acre in value over this period of time, from 1918 and 1927 until the present time?

Mr. McMILLAN. If the gentleman will yield, I understand this is marsh, swampland, and never will increase in value. I do not know what use they can make of the property. However, our committee certainly placed safeguards around this legislation to prevent any unusual speculations.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from South Carolina mean to say that farmland in Virginia enhanced only \$15 an acre in this period of time?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is the information they gave our committee. I do not know the value of property in that area. I am not an expert on land value in Virginia, or any other place. The District officials and District of Columbia Commissioners agreed on the price with certain safeguards. The gentleman from Iowa has a Virginian standing beside him. Perhaps he can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. If it will help the gentleman from Pennsylvania I will yield to him.

Mr. KEARNS. It certainly would, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that we worked out amicably in the committee. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] would be very honest in going along with this bill. We had no fight in the committee. The distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN], and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], and all of us were for it. My distinguished minority leader on the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], was for it.

The gentleman from Iowa can, of course, debate the matter on the floor of the House, but I think it was all done in the committee.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the purchase price of \$75,000 to which the gentleman referred includes the cost of the garbage reduction plant, and not

just the cost of the land alone. The garbage reduction plant has since been demolished, and is no longer being used. The \$75,000 was not just for the cost of the land alone.

Mr. Speaker, the committee also amended the bill to provide that the District of Columbia would be paid the reasonable market value of the land. I do not think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] would expect the county of Prince William or anyone else to pay more than the reasonable market value for the property. The cost of the land to the District government of \$75,000 included the garbage reduction plant.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to believe, I will say to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], that this land increased in value only \$15 an acre over such a period of time. As I understand it, the county wants it in order to set up what is known as an industrial park. In other words, they want to locate industry down there; is that correct?

What does the board of supervisors of the county want to do with the land?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa and to all of our colleagues that we ironed this out in the committee and with the very distinguished chairman of the committee, Mr. McMILLAN. We like the bill. If anyone wants to make an issue out of it, he can.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL. In answer to the gentleman's question, and I believe it is the same question he asked before, why there has been no greater increase in the value of the property since it was first purchased, the first 10 acres cost \$50,000, but that included the cost of the garbage reduction plant that has since then been demolished. The cost of the land itself at that time was not \$50,000. The total cost of the land was probably \$35,000. The reasonable market value today is apparently more than double what it was at that time. No one expects the county of Prince William or anyone else to buy that land for anything less than the reasonable market value, but no one can expect anyone else to pay more than the reasonable market value.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that the question arose in the minds of the committee as to the possibility of speculation in this land, is that not correct? The report indicates it. But there is nothing in the bill in the way of a restrictive clause providing that if the Prince William Board of Supervi-

sors gets this 455-acre tract that it must use it for the purpose for which the District of Columbia sells it to them.

Mr. BROYHILL. That is the reason we amended the bill so that instead of providing for a contract to be negotiated we provided for the land to be conveyed for its reasonable market value.

Mr. GROSS. The report indicates that the reasonable market value is \$85,000.

Mr. BROYHILL. What is wrong with that?

Mr. GROSS. That does not seem to me to represent a reasonable increase in value over such a long period of years.

Mr. BROYHILL. The language of the bill prohibits the land from being sold under negotiated contract for less than the reasonable market value.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have every respect for the Committee on the District of Columbia, but I do recall that the District of Columbia Committee came out with a bill to build a bridge across the Potomac River costing some \$15 million, and connecting the States of Virginia and Maryland. The committee has had no hesitancy in coming out with bills under which the taxpayers of the country take care of the facilities which are of great benefit to the States of Virginia and Maryland. The District of Columbia claims to be in need of revenue. I want to see the District get all of the money to which it is entitled in a deal of this kind. I do not think it is getting all that it is entitled to out of this deal.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think this needs some clarification. As to the cost of this property, it was bought many years ago, it is true. It was bought in two parcels. One parcel, consisting of 10 acres, cost \$50,000, upon which parcel was situated a rendering plant. The real purpose then was to have a rendering plant to render the garbage that came from the city of Washington.

They then bought for \$25,000 all of this 400 and some acres. They stopped using the rendering plant. It has been taken away and torn down.

There is nothing there but bare land. Much of it is very rough and mountains and other parts of it are swampland. The only thing that the District of Columbia uses it for now is as a fill in this swampland to get rid of the refuse from the District of Columbia. Under the contract which is to be negotiated between Prince William County and the District of Columbia, the District will continue to use the part they are now using for as long as they want to use it. That is a part of the agreement.

There was some discussion in the committee, and we were just as careful as the gentleman from Iowa always is to see that there was no opportunity for speculation in this land. This is a deal between a governing body in Virginia and the governing body in the District of Columbia.

It has the unanimous approval of the District Commissioners in a letter to the Speaker and is approved by the Bureau of Budget. The purpose of it is to take this land and organize a nonprofit gov-

ernmental corporation for the purpose of developing this property as an industrial park under the auspices and control of the county. Every safeguard has been put around it to see that any speculation by private persons in this situation shall not occur. As a matter of fact, there are private people who have been trying to get hold of this property for speculative purposes. I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa, I appreciate his diligence in looking after the proper interests of the Government and to see that we do not throw away any money and that we do not permit private people to make money by speculation in Government property. But, I think the gentleman knows, I am very sympathetic to that situation, and I raised some questions on the bill myself although I introduced the bill, and tightened it up with an amendment.

With reference to the price, it is not going to be \$85,000; there is going to be a reappraisal by the District Commissioners to ascertain what is the present fair value of that property with authority for the Commissioners to act.

If the gentleman from Iowa can suggest any further safeguards that we can put on this situation, I would be glad to hear them and consider them. But, certainly, the gentleman's fears about this being a speculative thing and that some private person is going to be able to make a profit in this situation are unfounded, I can assure him. I would be very happy to answer any question about this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with that assurance, I shall not object further to the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank my colleague.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, this bill will afford the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners the rather unique opportunity of aiding in the industrial development of a nearby county and at the same time benefiting the District of Columbia. This will be accomplished by authorizing the sale of a tract of some 455 acres of land now owned by the District and located near Quantico in Prince William County, Va.

Prior to 1918, the District of Columbia contracted with private companies for the disposal of the city's garbage. The largest of these companies owned and operated a garbage reduction plant on a tract known as Cherry Hill, on the Potomac River in Virginia. When the District decided in 1918 to operate its own garbage disposal system, the city purchased this plant, with about ten acres of land. Then in 1927, an additional 445 acres were acquired. The total purchase price for the entire tract was approximately \$75,000. The city operated the reduction plant until 1946. At that time, the operation was proving no longer economically practical, and so the plant was dismantled. Since that time, the only use the District of Columbia has made of this tract has been the dumping of a small amount of its garbage as a land-fill on some 25 acres of swampy land.

I am informed that the Prince William County Board of Supervisors has become interested in this land being purchased

from the District of Columbia and developed as an industrial park. They envision this project as a tremendous boost to the economy of Prince William County. Also, they have expressed their willingness to permit the District of Columbia to continue its present limited use of the property for an indefinite period of time.

The property has recently been appraised at \$85,000, which figure would represent a profit to the District.

I feel that the authorization to sell this land is entirely logical, and I welcome the opportunity to support a measure which will be mutually beneficial to both the District of Columbia and nearby Virginia.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H.R. 8916) to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums, not exceeding \$2,500,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary to enable the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (hereafter in this Act referred to as the Surgeon General) to make a grant or grants in order to assist the George Washington University in defraying the cost of planning and carrying out a project of construction to expand and improve the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available for such purpose until expended.

Sec. 2. Grants made pursuant to this Act shall not exceed, in the aggregate, an amount found by the Surgeon General to be equal to 50 per centum of the cost of construction of the project covered by an application of the university submitted to the Surgeon General and approved by him pursuant to section 3.

Sec. 3. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized to approve the application of the university if—

(1) the application is in such form as may be prescribed by him and contains or is supported by such information as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions under this Act;

(2) he finds that—

(A) the program of construction covered by the application provides for the facilities and services necessary (i) to provide adequate care for the patients expected to be served by the hospital and (ii) to constitute the hospital an adequate teaching hospital for the university's school of medicine;

(B) such program does not appear incompatible with any comprehensive plan for

health facilities for the metropolitan area of Washington that has been or is likely to be developed by a body found by the Surgeon General to be a responsible areawide planning group; and

(C) the plans and specifications for the project meet the minimum standards of construction and equipment prescribed for hospitals by regulation pursuant to section 622(e) of the Public Health Service Act; and

(3) he finds that the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurances—

(A) that adequate funds will be available for payment of the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of the project, and that adequate financial support for the maintenance and operation of the project when completed will be available;

(B) that the construction contract for the project will be awarded in accordance with such requirements, including requirements as to competitive bidding, as the Surgeon General may prescribe, and will contain such provisions for performance and other bonds and undertakings to be furnished by the contractor as the Surgeon General deems necessary;

(C) that the construction contract will provide that the Surgeon General and his representatives will at all times have access to the work in preparation or progress and that the contractor will provide proper facilities for such access and for inspection of the work;

(D) that the university will provide and maintain competent and adequate architectural or engineering supervision and inspection of the project to insure that the completed work conforms with the approved plans and specifications;

(E) that the labor standards set forth in section 5 will be observed; and

(F) such other assurances as the Surgeon General finds necessary in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Amendment of an approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application.

(c) After approval of the application, the Surgeon General shall pay the Federal share of the cost of construction (as determined under section 2) at such time or times, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and subject to such reasonable conditions (with respect to performance of work, purchase of materials, and other matters), as he may deem appropriate in order to safeguard the Federal interest and assure completion of the work in accordance with the approved plans and specifications.

(d) Funds paid under this section for construction shall be used solely for carrying out the project as approved by the Surgeon General, including any amendment approved by him.

Sec. 4. (a) For the purposes of this Act the terms "construction" and "cost of construction" shall have the meanings assigned to such terms in section 631 of the Public Health Service Act, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, and shall include architect's and consultant's fees incurred in the planning of the project prior to enactment of this Act.

(b) For the purpose of administering this Act, the Surgeon General may delegate to any officer or employee of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare any of his functions or powers under this Act, except the issuance of regulations.

Sec. 5. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276c-5),

and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Sec. 6 (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, for each fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses incurred in carrying out this Act.

(b) Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting or superseding any authority of the Surgeon General or the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under title VI of the Public Health Service Act or any other law.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 4, after line 4, insert the following:

"(D) that the university shall keep such records as the Surgeon General shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by it of the proceeds of assistance received under this Act, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"The Surgeon General and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the university that are pertinent to assistance received under this Act."

On page 4, line 5, change "(D)" to "(E)".

On page 4, line 10, change "(E)" to "(F)".

On page 4, line 12, change "(F)" to "(G)".

On page 3, line 8, strike "622(c)" and insert "622(e)".

On page 3, line 9, after the words "Service Act" insert the words "as amended, 42 U.S.C. 291e".

On page 5, line 10, after the words "Health Service Act" insert "as amended, 42 U.S.C. 291i".

Page 5, line 24, strike "(40 U.S.C. 276a-276c-5)" and insert "(40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5)".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

I thought perhaps we would have an explanation of the bill, but if it is going to passage without an explanation, I am compelled to ask some questions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina, chairman of the committee, how much the taxpayers of the Nation have spent on hospitals in the District of Columbia in recent years. Can the gentleman give me any idea of this? I understand this particular appropriation would authorize the direct appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the construction and expansion of hospital facilities at the George Washington University.

Mr. McMILLAN. The purpose of the bill is to provide matching funds in the amount of \$2,500,000 to George Washington University to construct 100 additional beds and certain research facilities and teaching facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman give me any idea how much we have provided for hospitals in the District of Columbia?

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. BROYHILL. The total Federal grants amount to \$40,455,453. That is for eight hospitals here in the District of Columbia. Incidentally, under the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act the Federal Government makes a grant of 70 percent. In this particular bill we provide for only a 50 percent matching grant, provided the other 50 percent is raised by private subscription.

Mr. GROSS. Why are not the hospitals in the District of Columbia built under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act?

Mr. BROYHILL. In the first place, as the gentleman knows, the District of Columbia is the Nation's Capital. It is different than any other section of the country.

Mr. GROSS. How does that make it different from the standpoint of taking care of the ill, the infirm, and so on and so forth? Why does it make any difference?

Mr. BROYHILL. The Congress of the United States has legislative responsibility in the District of Columbia. The Federal Government owns approximately 50 percent of the property in the District of Columbia, on which we do not pay taxes; instead, we make a contribution of approximately \$30 million a year to the operation of the District of Columbia. I would say to the gentleman that the Federal Government, as a property owner, is faring very well here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I think it is important in the consideration of this legislation to bear in mind the fact that the hospital which will benefit through the enactment of this legislation is the only downtown institution remaining. I think four hospitals were moved into outlying districts with the result that the accident load in this hospital is much larger than would ordinarily be the case; and I repeat, it is the only remaining downtown hospital, and it is a public hospital even though it happens to be connected with the George Washington University.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if we will have enough hospital facilities to take care of the situation in the District if we continue to have a need for emergency services rendered by this hospital, and for that matter, other hospitals in the District, to take care of emergencies such as that was mentioned in today's paper where a public transportation bus was invaded by a group of young hoodlums, a bus with 30 passengers on board. These hoodlums attacked the driver, severely beat him, and stole his money. The passengers were unloaded and put aboard another bus but not one of the 30 passengers would give his or her name

as a witness except a 17-year-old boy. I wonder if Congress can appropriate enough money to take care of the victims of all this lawlessness in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Do you know what I would like to do? This hospital we are speaking about is more or less a tribute to our Speaker of the House of Representatives. CARROLL KEARNS from Pennsylvania would like to be a factor in trying to get this bill passed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GROSS) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say to the gentleman that we took into consideration the fact that the District of Columbia does not fare as well as the various States under the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act for one reason that 200,000 Government people are not counted in the census of the District of Columbia. They were counted in their individual States. That reduces the per capita number of beds under the Hill-Burton Act. The average for the States is four, while for the District it is six beds per thousand.

Mr. GROSS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, and under the Hill-Burton Act, the District of Columbia could not qualify because of the fact that it far exceeds the national criteria for beds per 1,000 patients?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct. And the reason for that is there are about 200,000 Government employees, in addition to approximately 100 embassies with thousands of personnel. Outside the census, members of the Armed Forces, for instance, and others, who are located here. They have to be hospitalized but are not counted in the census and does not reflect properly in connection with beds available per capita.

Mr. GROSS. The District of Columbia already exceeds the number of hospital beds by about 2 percent of the national average; is that right?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes. According to the census but not actual count of floating population.

Mr. GROSS. But you want the taxpayers of all the country to provide \$2½ million through the process of this bill to expand hospital facilities in the District. In view of the fact that the District is already far above the national average in beds per 1,000 patients, the only excuse you can give for the bill is that you want to expand the medical facilities, medical training and care facilities, at this hospital. Are you prepared to accept an amendment that would provide that each State get \$2½ million to expand their medical training facilities?

Mr. McMILLAN. I certainly would approve an amendment of that nature

if it were germane to this bill. In fact, there is a bill coming out of the Committee on Interstate Commerce which will assist other medical schools. I know that we have a great shortage of doctors in my district. We have towns of 1,500 people without a doctor.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that the District of Columbia has the highest per capita income of any comparable city in the United States, I suppose.

Mr. McMILLAN. I have no particular reason to have any special love for the District, but I want to see the people working for the District of Columbia and the U.S. Government have sufficient hospital beds in our Nation's Capital in addition to the residence shown in last census.

Mr. GROSS. They already have them.

Mr. McMILLAN. They say they do not.

Mr. GROSS. Hospital beds here are available far above the national average.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, but it is very difficult to get a bed in a hospital here at times.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not true you have a little bit different situation? The District of Columbia is limited in its population to the District. It is different from the average metropolitan area, in that the metropolitan area here is not within the District of Columbia but is a burden upon the hospitals within the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. Why do not these contiguous areas then build hospitals to take care of the people who work here yet do not pay any taxes in the District of Columbia?

Mr. ALBERT. That question is not before us.

Mr. GROSS. Why should the taxpayers of the country be saddled with this?

Mr. ALBERT. For the reason, first of all, we have it already with respect to all the other hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but as the old saying goes, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. ALBERT. But I do not think this is a wrong.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do.

Mr. ALBERT. I do not admit that. But, the need has been demonstrated, if the gentleman will read the report. It seems to me that is the principal criterion, and if the Hill-Burton Act should be changed, we should change it and not take it out on the hospitals in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GROSS. I do not get that from the report. The report says in one place that legislation is needed because of the need for more hospital beds, and the report then goes on to say—I believe it is the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff—that it is needed for medical training facilities.

Mr. ALBERT. It is needed for both. I think that the report makes it clear that it is needed for both.

Mr. GROSS. They already have 6.2 beds per 1,000 as compared with the national average of 4.5 per 1,000.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is in order to try to resolve what I think is a very appropriate discussion which the gentleman has brought to the attention of the House. Since we are all quite familiar with the Hill-Burton program coming from our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to say to the gentleman that in addition to what the distinguished chairman of the committee and our distinguished majority leader have said, within the District of Columbia there are only a few acres of land actually available and, as you know, the formula includes not only population but area. Now, because of the fact that there is such a small area within the District of Columbia, about the only part of the formula that amounts to anything in the District is the population itself. For that reason the Nation's Capital, Washington, with a population estimated, I think, at around 800,000, does not benefit under this formula on the same equality or equitable proportion as do the States of the Nation. Now, that was recognized, I will say to the gentleman, in connection with the Washington Hospital Center. And, it might be recalled that the total amount for the Washington Hospital Center, which this Congress provided, was, I believe, something like \$23,410,000. Now, the share of that of the District of Columbia was \$10,500,000. And, the same is true of other hospitals here in the District, I believe, in the use of Hill-Burton funds. There had to be special recognition given to them, and possibly the same consideration is being asked here for George Washington Hospital.

Mr. GROSS. But the District is supposed to have the highest income in the Nation, is that not true?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is generally true. But, under the Hill-Burton formula you do not consider per capita income insofar as it relates to entitlement of the various States. You consider population and area.

Mr. GROSS. What I do not understand and never have is why, with this tremendous per capita income in the District of Columbia, the taxpayers cannot build some of the bridges, stadiums, and so on and so forth. Why do they have to go to the taxpayers of Iowa and Florida and everywhere else to get the money to do all these things for the District of Columbia?

Mr. HARRIS. I think that is a very good question. I have been seeking the answer for a long time myself.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN]:

It is my understanding, based upon the report and what has been said here today, that if this legislation is favorably acted upon we will be doing for the George Washington University Hospital only what we have done for other hospitals in the District of Columbia? Can the gentleman give us some assurance upon that point?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding, and that is what the testimony showed at the hearings.

Mr. ADAIR. So, by acting favorably on this matter we are simply acting in equity and good conscience?

Mr. McMILLAN. In fact, we did more for the Washington Methodist Center than we are doing for the George Washington University.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Which ought to be an object lesson to the House of Representatives and to the Congress that once we initiate these programs there apparently is no stopping.

Mr. ADAIR. I think we would all have to agree that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. This is the kind of a program that never should have been initiated in the first place. They should have been made to carry more of the responsibility than they are presently doing.

Mr. ADAIR. But once initiated—once the program is established, it is only proper and right that all hospital institutions be treated in the same way.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, my committee reported H.R. 8916 to the floor of the House for your consideration and it is my opinion that the House should take favorable action on same. The only argument against this bill was the statement that we are doing more for the hospitals in the city of Washington than we are for the hospitals in the individual States.

However, if you will read the letter we received from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, you will note that he states that the District of Columbia is not treated on an equal basis with the individual States in sharing the funds we appropriate to carry out the provisions of the Hill-Burton Act. I realize that we have approximately 200,000 Government employees and their families residing in the District of Columbia in addition to thousands of members of the Armed Forces and their families who are not counted in the census as being residents of the District of Columbia. All these people must be provided with hospitalization in case of illness and the figures indicated in the testimony from the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare during the hearings on this bill show that Washington has more hospital beds per capita than any State in the United States. However, it does not take into consideration the fact that we have a large floating population which must be hospitalized in case of illness.

I personally have never voted against an appropriation for extending hospital facilities in the States or in the District of Columbia. I have also never voted against any funds for cancer and heart research and I am advised that George Washington University Hospital is extending its research laboratories in addition to adding approximately 100 beds. George Washington University Hospital, at the present time, has one of the outstanding cancer clinics in the Nation and it seems to me that if we are financially able to spend \$7 billion in trying to send a man to the moon, we should be able to spend a few million dollars in trying to take care of the health of the people of this Nation.

I hope that the House will take favorable action on this bill since George Washington University, I understand, has already collected matching funds so that work can begin immediately in expanding the facilities at the George Washington University Hospital.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, this bill will authorize the Federal Government to appropriate \$2,500,000 toward the expansion and improvement of the George Washington University Hospital. These funds are to be matched by an equal amount from the university, which I understand has already been pledged or contributed by private sources.

There can be no question as to the need for this expansion of the hospital's facilities. The hospital was constructed during World War II, and wartime restrictions on materials necessitated a certain amount of compromise on the part of the university, both as to quality of construction and the amount of facilities obtained.

The George Washington University Hospital serves in two vital capacities as a highly essential part of the medical facilities of the Nation's Capital—for the treatment and care of the sick and as a training facility for medical students and interns—and its present plant is no longer adequate for either of these roles.

The present 427-bed capacity of the hospital does not accommodate the demand for admissions. Consequently, there is always a waiting list of patients seeking admission. In addition, other facilities of the hospital, such as operating rooms, X-ray and laboratory space, pharmacy, laundry, and dietary service, are not adequate for the present or future demand for patient care. In 1960, for example, the number of patients cared for in this hospital exceeded the maximum number which it was originally planned to accommodate by nearly 85 percent.

Concomitant with the crowding and inadequacy of the hospital's facilities for the treatment of patients, of course, is the detrimental effect of this situation upon the hospital's equally important role as a training facility for the university's medical students and interns. Improvement in the facilities of the hospital, such as H.R. 8916 will make possible, will very materially increase its effectiveness as a training ground for future physicians.

At present, approximately 35 percent of the patients cared for in the George Washington University Hospital are not

residents of the District of Columbia. This situation exists, of course, because the preponderance of the population of the Washington metropolitan area reside in the suburbs of Virginia and Maryland, and these suburbs do not provide sufficient hospital facilities to accommodate the needs of their own citizens. In view of this fact, and also because of the large floating population which Washington attracts because of its status as the Nation's Capital, I feel strongly that the Federal Government should share in the cost of this project. While it is true that the present George Washington University Hospital was built by a Federal grant under the Lanham Act, the university paid the very considerable costs of the land and the equipment. Also, George Washington University Hospital is the only voluntary hospital in the District which has not received Federal funds for construction under the Hospital Center Act.

If this \$5 million project were authorized under the Hospital Center Act, the Federal Government's share of the cost would be \$3,500,000, and the District of Columbia government would be obliged to pay \$1,500,000. Under the terms of H.R. 8916, however, the Federal Government will pay only \$2,500,000 and there will be no cost whatever to the District of Columbia. Thus, this bill represents a saving of \$1 million to the Federal Government and \$1,500,000 to the government of the District of Columbia, as compared to financing under the Hospital Center Act.

I recognize that this expansion of the facilities of the George Washington University Hospital is imperative as a major step toward meeting the increasing need for medical services and medical education in the Washington metropolitan area, and I take pleasure in endorsing H.R. 8916 as providing the best and soundest means of financing this vital project.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform the House that I have a special order for 1½ hours this coming Thursday in the hope that we will finish our regular business so that I can utilize that time to answer the gentleman from California's [Mr. KING] special order of last week in which he discussed some of the issues involved in this problem of health care for the aged, and in which he made some attack on the American Medical Association.

Mr. Speaker, I have no brief for the American Medical Association, or any

other group, but I am deeply concerned about fair debate and fair procedures in this issue of health care for the aged.

Mr. Speaker, I hope any other Members who would like to be present on Thursday and who would like to defend the use of the social security system for health care for the aged be present, because I certainly intend to present the arguments as to why this is a dangerous procedure for the health of all of us, and certainly would be damaging to health care for the older people.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, "If it isn't right, the girls won't take to it, and it won't last." Such was the byword of Juliette Gordon Low, first national president and founder of the Girl Scouts of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of this great American institution, and I feel it especially appropriate on this occasion to call the attention of the Congress to the outstanding record of this organization. For indeed over these past 50 years, the girls have "taken to the movement," it has "lasted," and "it is right."

For a half century, the Girl Scouts of the United States have offered informal education and training in the art and science of citizenship to literally millions of American youth. Our Nation owes a substantial debt to their heritage, and it is fitting and proper that we here in the Congress honor their efforts today.

Since its inception in 1912, this organization and its great leadership have always recognized the desirability of preparing young girls in the rudiments of house and home. As well, or perhaps even with increased fervor, they have also concentrated on the preparation of America's young girls for their role in our society. This, I think, is their outstanding contribution to our national character. The lists of prominent women in our country today, who had their first training in leadership as Girl Scouts, is lengthy and gratifying.

Likewise, over these first 50 years, innovation in programming has not been lacking in their movement. At every turn, Girl Scouts the world over were revolutionizing their status in what was predominantly a man's world. First to mind, of course, always comes the fact that it was the Girl Scouts who first introduced camping for girls. In camping, the Girl Scouts has led the way, not only in feminine circles, but they have established many trends in camping later adopted quite successfully by boys' institutions as well. They have proved in the past half century that the enjoyment and enrichment of one's person through

healthful outdoor living is not exclusively for boys.

The Girl Scouts of the United States have also developed warm and meaningful relationships with girls overseas and in many farflung parts of the world through their membership in the World Association of Girl Guides and Scouts. In more than 50 countries the free and wholesome, friendly exchange of ideas and cultures between international Girl Scouts has greatly fostered the mutual causes of world peace and understanding. Such exchanges are possible within the Girl Scout movement through such programs as the Juliette Low World Friendship Fund which provides the means for exchanges on an international level.

Of course, the Girl Scout program could not be the success that it is without the devoted and tireless guidance and leadership of the many well-trained, voluntary, and skillful adult leaders. The training program of the Girl Scouts of the United States has set an enviable pattern for similar organizations for years, and it has been a primary factor in the value of the movement.

Service to other people has always been a major objective of the Girl Scouts the world over. Built into their promise and law, by which every Girl Scout strives to live, service to their fellow man has been the heart of the Scout movement for 50 years. Who of us has never seen a Girl Scout assisting in a hospital, on a library project, with an overseas aid program, or in some civic function? I daresay, none of us. Girl Scouts are everywhere and always seeking out new and evermore useful ways in which they may expend their energies in behalf of others.

This is certainly a memorable occasion for this wonderful organization. One on which they prefer to look ahead toward the coming 50 years rather than back on the past 50 successful years. Through their various programs, the Girl Scouts of the United States have directly affected the lives of more than 2½ million American girls and 773,000 adult volunteers. Indirectly, they have given much to us all. As a Member of Congress, the husband of a den mother, and the father of three Girl Scouts, I am proud to recognize and congratulate the accomplishments of the last 50 years, not as 50 years completed, but rather as the first 50 years of a long and successful existence.

UNNECESSARY AIR FORCE EXPENDITURES

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to three recent reports of the Comptroller General disclosing, in the area investigated, more than \$25 million worth of unnecessary Air Force expenditures. These reports reviewed Air Force practice in maintaining aircraft for the

Military Air Transport Service, in operating the SAGE system and in procurement and storage policies.

Let me cite a few examples of the exceedingly poor business practices that have led to the aggregate sum wasted:

From the Comptroller General's report to Congress, February 1962, "Examination of Aircraft Maintenance Practices for Transport Aircraft in the Military Air Transport Service, Department of the Air Force" I found that in 1960 the Military Air Transport Service spent far more on maintenance and labor costs than private airlines with comparable practices and similar aircraft. Dollar loss: \$13 million.

The Comptroller General's "Review of Programing and Procurement of Selected Operational Equipment and Communication Services and the Utilization of Certain Technical Personnel by the Department of the Air Force in the Semiautomatic Ground Environment System" indicates that in administering SAGE, radar warning and weapons control system, the Air Force failed to reduce equipment to actual needs as indicated by operational experience. They also failed to cancel contracts for equipment which experience showed to be unnecessary. Dollar loss: \$10.8 million.

In addition, that report shows that the Air Force improperly calculated service charges for canceled services released to other users, generously underestimating actual costs. Dollar loss, \$1.5 million plus.

Another report in "Review of Procurement and Storage of General-Use Hand Tools for the Air Force by General Services Administration" finds that as of 1960 GSA considered that 27 percent of its total Air Force hand tool inventory represented an oversupply. Dollar cost, \$1.7 million. Annual cost of carrying the oversupply, \$170,000.

These samples from 1 month of auditing reports show that the Air Force is by no means the most efficient business operation. Their recurrent demands for increased appropriations should be judged in the light of their record for sloppy administration and estimation of needs.

It is true that the Air Force has already instituted some corrective measures and should be commended for this; however, it is incomprehensible to me how the Air Force has managed its affairs with so little regard to efficiency and good commonsense business practices. Without the report by the Comptroller General, it appears that the Air Force would have continued compounding inefficiency with inefficiency.

I strongly urge the Air Force and the Department of Defense to respond immediately to the specific recommendations of the Comptroller General. I urge them in continuing their maintenance studies for the Military Air Transport Service to seek "the assistance of qualified representatives of the airline industry and the Federal Aviation Agency," and to "seriously consider the possibility of effecting greater economies by replacing, wherever militarily feasible, military mechanics in the MATS organization with civilian mechanics," as the report proposes. I highly recom-

mend that the Air Force see that GSA receive sufficient information of its plans and needs in the future so that GSA can "effectively adjust procurement actions to realistic requirements."

In addition I strongly suggest that the Air Force take the initiative for further self-investigation and eliminate additional unwise business procedures.

CUBAN EMBARGO FULL OF LOOPHOLES AS RESULT OF ADMINISTRATIVE RULING—PRESIDENT REFUSES TO CLOSE LOOPHOLES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Kentucky). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, the object of which is to plug the glaring and gaping loophole in the administration's embargo against the importation of goods from Cuba, as announced February 3 by the President. I feel compelled to bring this loophole to the attention of the House again, because the true object of the embargo is now being circumvented by the administration itself.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the object of the embargo was to halt the flow of dollars to the Communist Castro Government of Cuba. The philosophy was to cut off the dollars by cessation of imports of Cuban goods and materials. I have no quarrel with this objective, and I am sure that the American people are in favor of the argument that we need to rid this hemisphere of Castro and his ilk.

And no group is more sympathetic to the objective of getting rid of Castro and communism than the good people of my district, including the 6,000 cigar workers of the city of Tampa, and this group, through its spokesmen, has often declared its willingness to make every reasonable sacrifice necessary in order to get rid of Castro, providing these sacrifices are backed up by other effective actions to get the job done.

But unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it is now apparent that while the embargo on imports was ordered by the President, another executive agency was opening a gaping loophole I have referred to, and thus the administration, through its spokesmen in the Foreign Assets Control Division of the Treasury Department, has ruled that cigars made from tobacco imports from Cuba may be imported into the United States from foreign countries.

And, as a result, the people in my district lose their jobs, people in the Canary Islands and possibly Canada, Britain, West Germany, and other European Cuban tobacco importers get new jobs, and Castro still gets his dollars or other spendable currency to finance his hemisphere Communist efforts.

I think this, compounded by indifference to protests received, including my own, amounts to a cold-blooded and unconcerned attitude by the administration toward the plight of the 6,000 Tampa cigar workers, 10 percent of whom are already out of work as a result of the embargo. I say this further, because

a Presidential White House assistant named Feldman was recently quoted in the newspapers as having said that the loophole could be plugged in 10 minutes, if necessary. And now I am wondering if the remaining 5,400 cigar workers in Tampa must be thrown out of work before the administration deems such a necessity to exist.

To repeat, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the purpose of the embargo, which is to drive the present Communist Government of Cuba from this hemisphere, but I must protest when that embargo opens up a loophole that allows Havana tobacco, either as a finished or semifinished product, to come into this country at the expense of 6,000 cigar workers in my district, and many others in other areas of the country, who, in the main, are skilled in no other trade and who will experience great difficulty in obtaining other employment.

Many of these cigar workers are older citizens and are following what has long been a family trade, that of making largely handmade cigars.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, provides criminal penalties in the form of fines or imprisonment for the importation from any country into the United States of any article that is made of products grown, produced, processed, or manufactured in Cuba.

It also prohibits under the same penalties the export of further articles from this country to Cuba. The only exceptions to such imports and exports are those connected with the operation of any military or naval base of the United States situated in Cuba.

NEED FOR BILL CLOSING EMBARGO LOOPHOLES

I had hoped that the administration would immediately take action to close the gaping loophole by Executive order or administrative ruling preventing the importation of any goods from any country that contained Cuban exports, at least Cuban tobacco, but a deaf ear has been turned to our pleas.

The following articles by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, explain the plight of the Tampa cigar workers and the asininity of the administration's program, whereby one hand issues the embargo order while the other hand undercuts it, yet the administration refuses to acknowledge it:

[From the New York Journal-American, Feb. 22, 1962]

NEW RULING SENDS EMBARGO ON CUBAN TOBACCO UP IN SMOKE

(By Leslie Gould)

Relax and light up that all-Havana corona or panatela.

There is going to be no shortage of Cuban imports, regardless of the widely publicized embargo ordered by President Kennedy on products from the Communist-controlled island off our shores.

The Foreign Assets Control Division of the U.S. Treasury has just ruled:

"Goods, including cigars, made from imports from Cuba may be imported into the United States from the Canary Islands."

The ruling was made by Mrs. Margaret W. Schwartz, Acting Chief of the Division.

COUNSEL AFFIRMS RULING

At Mrs. Schwartz's side when she handed down the decision was Stanley Sommerfeld,

General Counsel of the Division. The pair further affirmed:

"Any and all goods processed or manufactured from Cuban imports in a country considered friendly (or at least neutral) may be imported into this country."

This makes a joke of the President's proclamation of February 3 ordering an embargo on trade between the United States and Cuba.

ORDER CLEARLY BANS IMPORTS

The Presidential order stated:

"Hereby prohibit, effective 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962, the importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba; and hereby authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out such prohibition, to make such exceptions thereto, by license or otherwise, as he determines to be consistent with the effective operation of the embargo hereby proclaimed, and to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to perform such functions."

The order clearly prohibits all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from and through Cuba, but the rulings of the Foreign Assets Control Division nullify the embargo. Cigars made outside Cuba from Cuban tobacco, as well as leaf processed may now be imported.

Leaf before it is made into cigars is stripped—that is, the stem is removed—and the leaf is cut up. If either of these processes is done outside Cuba, then the Cuban tobacco can be imported.

CANADA-MADE CIGARS EXEMPT

Before issuing this latest ruling, the Customs Service announced the embargo did not apply to Canadian-made cigars of Cuban tobacco. Now, this exception is extended to the Canary Islands or any friendly country, or at least neutral.

This now becomes no embargo at all, except to the large American companies now making all-Havana cigars at Trenton, N.J., and Tampa, Fla.—the two biggest such cigarmaking centers in the United States. They may, though, import processed leaf. Their other option is to move their factories to friendly countries such as Canada. This would cost American jobs.

When the embargo was announced it was stated Cuba would be shut off from \$35 million in exports to the United States. This would cut off that many needed American dollars.

TWO MILLION DOLLARS A YEAR IMPORTS

Cuban cigar imports amount to around \$2 million a year, plus imports of leaf.

For most cigarmakers—embargo or no embargo—this means very little. Havana-made cigars accounted for less than half of 1 percent of domestic cigar sales. Many of the other cigars, which are blends, do use Cuban tobacco. For blending, tobacco is obtained from the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Puerto Rico and from U.S. growers.

In addition to Canada, Cuban tobacco is imported by Britain, West Germany and other Western European countries. Japan and Mexico also do business with Cuba.

The aim of the embargo on goods of Cuban origin was to bar dollars for Castro's use in carrying on his subversion in Latin America. The front door may be closed, but a back door has now been opened, and Castro will get his dollars.

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 5, 1962]

CUBAN CIGARS, SI, TWO HONG KONG SHIRTS,
NO—THAT'S OFFICIAL
(By Leslie Gould)

This is a tale—or maybe tall—of two shirts from Hong Kong versus cigars from Castro's Cuba.

The shirts—\$9 worth—can't come into the United States, but the cigars and tobacco—\$35 million worth—can.

Who says?

The Acting Director of the Foreign Assets Control Section of the U.S. Treasury—Mrs. Margaret W. Schwartz.

Mrs. Schwartz, acting under orders from the Secretary of the Treasury, is afraid the aforesaid two Hong Kong shirts may have a little silk originating in Red China. They haven't, but she isn't sure because the gift shipment failed to include one of those certificates of origin.

"NO TICKEE, NO SHIRTEE"

So, the two shirts, costing about \$4.50 each, are about to make the long return journey to Hong Kong.

That's the law, she says.

No tickee—that is, no certificate—no shirtee.

This is the law, so there is no point in quarreling with the bureaucratic mind.

But the same Mrs. Schwartz—also on orders from the Secretary of the Treasury—says it is OK to bring Cuban cigars and tobacco into the United States, as long as they first touch base in some other land. There is no question of origin, as in the case of the Hong Kong shirts—although both Red China and Cuba are Communist-run.

J.F.K. EMBARGOED CUBAN CIGARS

The Foreign Assets Control order permitting Cuban cigars and tobacco to come in through the backdoor is contrary to the spirit, if not the letter of a proclamation by President Kennedy to embargo trade with the Communist-dominated island off our shores.

The President's order stated:

"I * * * hereby prohibit, effective 12:01 a.m., eastern standard time, February 7, 1962, the importation into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba."

There was a loophole in the order, giving the Secretary of the Treasury the power to make "such exceptions thereto, by license or otherwise, as he determines to be consistent with the effective operation of the embargo hereby proclaimed."

Under the apparent direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mrs. Schwartz has ruled:

"Goods, including cigars, made from imports from Cuba may be imported into the United States from the Canary Islands."

PLENTY OF CIGARS PROMISED

At the same time, Mrs. Schwartz and the Foreign Assets Control general counsel—Stanley Sommerfield—affirmed:

"Any and all goods processed or manufactured from Cuban imports in a country considered friendly (or at least neutral) may be imported into this country."

As a result of this ruling by Foreign Assets Control, one of the leading importers of Havana cigars has sent the good word out to its customers—

Stop worrying about the supply of Cuban cigars. There will be plenty for years to come. The market will be supplied by England.

CASTRO GETTING DOLLARS

The object of the embargo on cigars and tobacco from Cuba was to shut off dollars flowing into the pockets of the Red Premier of Cuba—Castro—who in turn was using the funds to finance Communist subversion in Latin America.

The only trouble is that Foreign Assets Control is allowing the dollars to flow indirectly into Cuba, but it is very stuffy about anything from Hong Kong—such as \$9 worth of shirts.

What Mrs. Schwartz, the Acting Director of Foreign Assets Control, is in effect saying:

"It's OK to smoke Cuban cigars and tobacco, but not in Hong Kong shirts."

Mr. Speaker, I also received a mealy-mouthed, say-nothing, do-nothing reply to my request to the White House—not from the White House, but from the Department of State. In my letter of February 17, which follows, I requested that this loophole be closed:

FEBRUARY 17, 1962.

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Reliable sources indicate that despite your Presidential embargo on imports from Cuba, specifically including Havana tobacco, this embargo does not include the importation of cigars made from Havana tobacco, which obviously leaves a substantial loophole that could negate the effect of the embargo order so far as tobacco is concerned. It is my understanding that other nations can export to this country cigars containing Havana tobacco and there is no restrictions against such importation, which obviously not only negates the embargo order but also works an undue hardship on the cigar industry and is patently discriminatory against the 6,000 cigar workers in Tampa, Fla., who have indicated their willingness to make necessary sacrifices in order to get rid of Fidel Castro and Communists in this country, provided you back them up and make the embargo fully effective.

It is obvious that Havana tobacco can be used for the manufacture of cigars in other countries to be shipped to the United States without restriction, that a gaping loophole does exist and that Castro can obviously acquire American dollars to aid in promotion of his Communist regime.

Therefore, I am requesting that you investigate this matter immediately and that the necessary Executive orders be issued to plug up this loophole so to thus deny Castro much needed financial backing for his communistic efforts, to combat this discrimination against the Tampa cigar industry, and that you at the same time consider other effective means to get rid of communistic strongholds and military threats to the peace of this hemisphere.

I call your attention to my wire of February 3 addressed to you, in which I made certain recommendations and to which I have not received a reply; to wit,

1. Recognition of and support for a free anti-Communist government in exile.

2. An announcement that the United States will not permit the in-shipment from Russia, Red China and Communist satellite nations of additional heavy war materiel which is being used to make Cuba a Communist stronghold and military threat to the peace of this hemisphere;

3. To shut off the \$5 million drain from the payroll at Guantanamo, pay which is being stolen by Castro right outside the gates by forcing the exchange of dollars for pesos;

4. Establishing a firm policy relating to alliance-for-progress aid dollars that they will be available only to countries that back up the Punta del Este expulsion of Cuba by necessary sanctions in order to get rid of Castro;

5. That aid and assistance to Communist satellite nations and Communist sympathetic nations that will openly aid Castro, such as Poland, will be denied;

6. Prevention of further flascos that aid Castro, such as permitting one of the ships carrying the jet fighters to Yugoslavia to stop in Havana in a cloud of secrecy and heavy guard;

7. To give relief to the Tampa cigar industry and its employees, inasmuch as this will become a substantial unemployment area as soon as the present stockpiles are exhausted;

8. To give tax relief to the industry for the loss that results, in that the industry has been unable to find an effective substitute

for Havana tobacco. Certainly if our foreign policy dictates the need for millions of dollars overseas to help win our fight for freedom, financial support and tax writeoffs to this industry at home, which will be hit hard by this ban, is likewise justified.

I would appreciate hearing from you.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the reply which was to the effect that the administration intended to do nothing now, follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 10, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CRAMER: The Department of State has been asked to reply to your letter of February 17, 1962, addressed to the President concerning the embargo on the importation of Cuban goods. I am transmitting a separate reply to the matters which you raised in your telegram of February 3, 1962, to the President and to which you again refer in your letter.

The Department shares your concern over the possible circumvention of the embargo by the sale in the United States of cigars manufactured in other countries from tobacco grown in Cuba. The objective of the recent U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba, as you know, is to deprive the Castro regime of its dollar earnings in the United States and thus reduce the capacity of the Castro-Communists to engage in activities endangering the security of the hemisphere. The embargo does not apply to goods manufactured in another country containing Cuban components.

There is no indication of any significant increase since the effective date of the embargo in the importation of cigars manufactured abroad from Cuban tobacco. The Department, in cooperation with other agencies of the Government, is watching for any changes in the pattern of U.S. trade with other countries which may result from the embargo. If future developments indicate that the objective of the embargo is not being realized, we will take appropriate action under existing law or under such legislation as might be enacted.

Please call on us if we can be of any further assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the letter that only when the horse has been stolen—the \$55 million Havana cigar market in the United States—by foreign countries will the barn door—the gaping loophole containing Cuban tobacco permitting foreign countries to ship into the United States, cigars, and even perhaps processed Cuban tobacco—be closed—and then maybe. It is obvious that it will take some time before an increase in Havana cigar imports from foreign countries will substantially increase, but I understand that foreign manufacturers are beginning to tool up to take advantage of this windfall. It thus becomes imperative that they be put on notice now that their trading with Cuba for export to the United States will not be permitted.

The following editorial from the Tampa Times of Friday, March 9, 1962, adequately answers the indifference of the administration to this problem:

CIGAR WORKERS HAVE A POINT

Tampa's cigar workers are frightened and angry.

They see in the Federal embargo on importation of Cuban leaf a threat to their credit and their livelihood. They ask themselves and each other, "What is to become of us?" They meet in stormy protest sessions and pledge a march on city hall. They condemn in bitter terms those who supported the embargo and plead for a word from the administration—a word of comfort, reassurance, explanation. And there is no answer.

The embargo challenges credulity. The Government says that no U.S. manufacturer may import the vital tobacco which goes into the making of the favored Havana cigar. But it does not say that Havana cigars made in other countries cannot be imported. Already there are signs that Cuban leaf barred from the United States will be purchased by Canadian, West German, Spanish, and other foreign cigar companies with an eye on the lucrative U.S. market.

Add it all up and there is but a single, discouraging answer. The embargo will not materially damage the economy of Communist Cuba. It is cutting the heart out of the cigar industry in Tampa and sending skilled workers into the streets in search of other jobs for which they have no training. It is paring the purchasing power of an important segment of our people with a demand for sacrifice that has no perceptible meaning.

And the effect is not just for today, tomorrow or the day after Castroism falls. There is danger of a permanent displacement and an end to the tradition of fine cigarmaking in Tampa.

No evidence has come from other parts of the United States that Havana cigars will be boycotted because tobacco in them was grown in Red-tilled ground. A cartoonist might picture an affluent character puffing on an imported Havana and shaking his head in concern over headlines listing the latest excesses of Castroism. That would adequately depict the element of irony which pervades the entire issue. And this point is inescapable: until the Government takes that Havana out of the cartoon figure's mouth by prohibiting imports of cigars containing Cuban tobacco, its embargo on bulk tobacco imports is meaningless.

When the Havana cigar market in the United States is destroyed, then—and then only—will there be firm basis for talk of marketing a substitute premium cigar.

In the meanwhile, what will happen to our people here?

There has been some talk at both the State and local level of aid to displaced cigar workers. But so far these individuals have seen no evidence of action to support promises.

We have heard, too, of pleas of faith in the administration's planning and suggestions that everything will work for the best. We would like to believe this. Perhaps if the several responsible Federal agencies in charge of ordering and enforcing the embargo would take Tampans into their confidence, there would be less tension and a broader attitude of cooperation with governmental planning.

Unfortunately, there are disturbing signs that planning lags behind reality. We hear reports that investors in several foreign countries have placed heavy orders for cigarmaking equipment and that New York distributors are telling their customers plenty of pure Havana cigars will be imported.

Against this background the Treasury Department has issued a vague statement that "it does not appear there has been any significant increase in the importation of cigars manufactured abroad from Cuban tobacco." (Of course not, the supply of Havana leaf in this country has not yet been exhausted.) And the Treasury spokesman adds: "If it appears * * * that the objectives of the embargo are being frustrated * * * appropriate action will be taken to fulfill (them)."

But will the appropriate action be taken in time to save the jobs of several thousand Tampa cigar workers?

That is the question in search of an immediate answer.

Mr. Speaker, these circumstances leave me no alternative but to introduce legislation to plug this gaping loophole and to make the Cuban embargo truly effective in view of the refusal of the Kennedy administration to take the 10 minutes which its own White House spokesman, Mr. Meyer Feldman, admits is all it will take for the administration to act.

I have also requested that as soon as the Manpower Retraining Act is passed by Congress, which seems imminent, and is signed into law that the cigar workers of Tampa be given priority consideration and the full authority under the act be brought to bear to lighten the unemployment load already being felt in the Tampa cigar industry. I was assured by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and the ranking Republican when the House turned down my amendment to the bill that would have required such priority treatment, that it would be forthcoming so far as their recommendations were concerned without the amendment. I trust that the administration will implement this assurance made to me as representative of the Tampa cigar workers.

I intend to follow up my appeal on the House floor, and my requests to the President, with further requests to the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare who have the authority under the Manpower Retraining Act.

I also include hereafter a letter and resolution protesting this loophole from the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc.:

CIGAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
OF AMERICA, INC.,

New York, N.Y., March 8, 1962.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: More than a month ago, the President proclaimed an embargo prohibiting the importation of all goods of Cuban origin. When the embargo was proclaimed, the cigar manufacturing industry assumed that it would be total in effect. The industry was and still is ready and willing to accept that pronouncement as the declared policy of our Government.

Now it appears that loopholes exist. The Foreign Assets Control Division of the Treasury Department has ruled that (1) cigars made of Cuban tobacco may be imported into the United States if made in a foreign country other than Cuba, and (2) Cuban leaf tobacco may also be imported if "substantially transformed" in such foreign country. The effects of these loopholes are more fully described in the enclosures.

This ruling has caused great consternation in the industry. The backdoor trading with Cuba permits Castro to continue to receive U.S. dollars indirectly. Moreover, the loopholes are an open invitation to unscrupulous speculators to profit at the expense of the American consumer, the U.S. cigar industry, and its employees. The cigar industry is and will be adversely affected by the embargo in its present form, particularly if merchandise comparable to that which it customarily produces or uses in production is made available in the U.S. market while the scrupulous manufacturer is denied ac-

cess to Cuban raw materials through normal channels.

To avoid such back-door trading, our board of directors unanimously urged the President to make the Cuban embargo total in all its aspects. The enclosed resolution was sent to the President and certain members of his Cabinet.

We believe that the time has come for Congress to close all avenues of direct and indirect trading with Cuba. We respectfully request your assistance, through legislative means if necessary, to make the Cuban embargo total in effect.

We await your favorable action.

Respectfully yours,

CARL J. CARLSON,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CIGAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., REGARDING THE CUBAN EMBARGO

Whereas the President of the United States by Proclamation No. 3447, dated February 3, 1962, proclaimed an embargo upon trade between the United States and Cuba and thereby prohibited the importation, effective 12:01 a.m., e.s.t., February 7, 1962, into the United States of all goods of Cuban origin and all goods imported from or through Cuba; and

Whereas it was stated by the President that the embargo "will deprive the Government of Cuba of the dollar exchange it has been deriving from sales of its products in the United States" and that "the loss of this income will reduce the capacity of the Castro regime, intimately linked with the Sino-Soviet bloc, to engage in acts of aggression, subversion, or other activities endangering the security of the United States and other nations of the hemisphere"; and

Whereas despite the avowed intention of the President in proclaiming such embargo, the Foreign Assets Control Division of the Treasury Department has ruled that cigars containing Cuban tobacco in whole or in part, manufactured in countries other than Cuba, may nevertheless be imported into the United States; and

Whereas it appears that such embargo, as provided for in said proclamation, does not affect Cuban tobacco if it is substantially transformed in a foreign country other than Cuba and is then imported into the United States; and

Whereas unless such embargo be total in effect, (1) the desired effects of the President's embargo proclamation will be nullified, (2) said embargo in its present form will permit back-door transactions with Cuba contrary to the spirit and intent of said proclamation, (3) the Cuban Government will continue to obtain foreign exchange; and

Whereas the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., is a trade association composed of cigar manufacturers located throughout the United States whose production, in dollars and units, collectively represents in excess of 80 percent of the nearly 7 billion cigars sold in the United States: Now, therefore,

The Board of Directors of the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., in meeting assembled this day, do hereby unanimously resolve, That we urge the President of the United States immediately to take such steps as may be necessary to prohibit the importation into the United States of all tobaccos grown in Cuba and tobacco products containing Cuban tobacco in whole or in part, regardless of where such tobacco products may have been manufactured or where such tobacco may have been transformed after the effective date of the embargo as aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Cigar Manufacturers Association of America, Inc., be and they hereby are empowered to publish these preambles and

resolutions and to take such steps as they may deem desirable or necessary to effectuate the intent and purposes of these resolutions including but not limited to bringing them to the attention of Congress, if congressional action be required.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

ARAB OIL OFFICIAL THREATENS TO CUT OFF MIDEAST SUPPLY

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the most powerful oil official in the oil-soaked Middle East is Sheikh Abdullah Tariki, of Saudi Arabia. He is general director of petroleum and mineral affairs for that vast Middle East monarchy. He also is a director of Aramco, the combination of American companies which hold the Saudi Arabian oil-producing concession.

Mr. Tariki was educated at the University of Texas, but his sentiments and actions qualify him as a radical Arab nationalist. In an article on "The Oil of the Arab World," in the February 17 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, he reveals his contempt for the oil companies holding Middle East oil concessions and the Western nations which have bought more than \$2.5 billion worth of his oil.

According to the Post article, Tariki "preaches a doctrine of integration" of the Arab world. He argues for ever-greater Arab control over Middle East oil. To achieve this control, he contends these Arab countries must act in concert.

Post writer Harold Martin attributes to Mr. Tariki this shocking statement:

Some day we will unite. Once we are strong enough to shut down all the wells, and close the Suez Canal, and shut off the pipelines—even if only for a few days—the (oil) companies will suddenly see a great light. The world cannot live without the Mideast's oil.

Twice since World War II, Mr. Speaker, Arab nationalism has brought on frightening disruptions in the flow of Middle East oil. The first occasion came when the eccentric Premier Mossadegh nationalized the Iranian oil industry. The other was when the Egyptian dictator Nasser closed the Suez Canal and his Arab neighbors—out of a weird sense of sympathy—sabotaged the Middle East oil pipelines.

I need not remind my colleagues to whom our free world allies looked to fill the breach in these instances. They looked to the same source which provided most of the oil for World War I, for World War II, and to the source which must provide our first line of defense for world war III, should such a calamity ever be visited upon this worried planet. They looked to the domestic

petroleum industry in the United States of America.

Our European allies, since the Suez crisis, have been worried and concerned. They indeed have cause for worry and concern. The NATO countries, through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, have frantically sought, through compulsory stockpiling, to prepare themselves for the next impulsive denial of oil for their factories, their transportation systems and their homes.

We need no longer indulge in conjecture as to whether another Middle East incident will deny essential oil supplies to the free world. We need only speculate as to when this might occur. The most influential oil spokesman in the Middle East, Sheikh Tariki, has served notice in language plain and blunt as to his desires and intent.

That intent, Mr. Speaker, is to bring the Western World to its knees for want of oil, and to make the oil companies operating in the Middle East see a great light.

I hope that my colleagues in the Congress of the United States do not have to wait for Mr. Tariki's impulsive and threatened oil crisis to see the light. I submit that the light already is plain enough. Laid bare in the glare of Mr. Tariki's vindictive warning is the fact that this Nation cannot afford and cannot indulge in dependence for its security, and for the security of its allies, on any oil except its own.

Those of us so long concerned with the problem of oil imports, which are undermining our oil security and our entire energy mobilization base, see here dramatic proof of our worst fears. We have been served notice, not in Arabic, but in plain English, by the American-educated Mr. Tariki, that when the time is right, and by his whim, the free world will be denied access to Middle East oil.

For whatever obscure purpose may possess him, Sheikh Tariki is saying blandly that his grand design is to turn off the Middle East oil valve. Mr. Speaker, this is an awesome and frightening threat. It places the West in a fearfully uncertain and insecure position. Such action could indeed be devastating to the European nations now almost entirely dependent on the Middle East for oil.

The Saturday Evening Post depicts this European dependence on the Middle East as follows:

Every day tankers from the Mideast deliver 2,500,000 barrels of oil to the refineries of Western Europe. These are our allies, the NATO countries. If this oil were cut off, their factories would shut down, the booming economy which supports their armies would collapse, and our defense against the land armies of Mr. Khrushchev would crumble.

This is the grim specter contained in the threat by Mr. Tariki to "shut down all the wells, and close the Suez Canal and shut off the pipelines."

I do not need to paint for my colleagues a picture of the implications of this threat. Mr. Tariki's words are so forthright and so vivid as to speak for themselves.

However, his warning strikes to the very heart of an issue now before this Congress and before the administration. That is the important question of whether or not we deal effectively with the crucial problem of oil imports, or whether by default we follow the alternative of becoming further and further dependent for essential energy supplies on the Tarikis and other equally emotional custodians of remote and insecure petroleum resources.

We need not submit to fear and radicalism. Fortunately for our country and for our allies, we have a choice in the matter. If we become dependent on Middle East or other foreign oil it will be as a matter of choice, not as a matter of necessity.

We are now at the point of decision. The awesome potential of the atomic bomb has so shocked the world that we may now hope it will not be used to trigger a world conflagration. But if we become dependent on Middle East oil then the closing of a valve by Tariki or the Suez by Nasser would force us into war. A strong domestic oil industry is insurance for peace. If we had not been able to give assurance that U.S. oil was available to Europe during the Suez crisis in 1956 war would have been inevitable. We must keep the domestic oil-producing industry strong during these perilous times.

I call to the attention of my colleagues that 375,000 barrels daily of Middle East crude oil and petroleum products were imported into the United States in 1961. This is a new record of imports from this turbulent and restless area. This record was established in spite of an import control program which was designed to stabilize imports and to reduce our dependence for oil on resources beyond our control.

Total imports from all sources into the United States also established a new record of 1,890,000 barrels daily. This is an increase of more than 450,000 barrels a day since 1956. In this same period, crude oil production in the United States has remained virtually static despite our capability to produce an additional 3,000,000 barrels daily now shut in for lack of market. In other words, in this 5-year period, the domestic petroleum industry has surrendered practically all of the increase in demand for crude oil and its products to foreign oil.

Is it any wonder that essential oil exploration, discovery, drilling, and development have dropped steadily in this period? Is it any wonder that the search for new domestic petroleum supplies has dropped by almost one-third in 5 years, reflected in a 30-percent decline in wild-cat well drilling?

While the domestic oil-producing industry has suffered continuous deterioration during the past 6 years, all of the principal foreign oil-producing areas have enjoyed a substantial increase in production. For example, Middle East production increased 63 percent; Venezuela, 18 percent; Canada, 31 percent; and Russia, 100 percent.

We are by default and by sheer folly pursuing a course of almost certain dependence on foreign oil. We are not

doing so by lack of places to drill. We are doing so by artificially and unnecessarily placing our dependence more and more on foreign oil, and thereby killing off incentives to drill.

We have no choice but to reverse this drift to dependence on foreign oil. It will require no dramatic or drastic actions. It does require that we stabilize oil imports in relation to domestic crude oil production, as the mandatory import program was intended but failed to do.

Independent domestic oil producers, who historically have found and developed 80 percent of domestic petroleum supplies, have requested only that imports be reduced by 250,000 barrels daily and that thereafter imports be permitted to increase or decrease in relation to domestic crude production. This would assure foreign oil a portion of any increase in petroleum demand. It would likewise, for the first time in 5 years, assure domestic producers a portion of the increase in their own market.

The reduction of oil imports by 250,000 barrels daily would constitute mild action. The bulk of imports today originates in Venezuela and the Middle East. Last year alone production in the Middle East increased 357,000 barrels daily and in Venezuela 60,000 barrels daily. Such a small reduction in imports could not have any substantial adverse effect upon the economies of those countries. Such action, however, would provide a very definite encouragement to the domestic industry. In my opinion it is essential that such action be taken if we are to revive the domestic industry.

The administration, through the Office of Emergency Planning, now has the oil import program under study. In the interest of maintaining a strong petroleum industry and our security as to oil, they can do no less than adopt the measures I have just described.

To do less is to risk placing this Nation further and further at the mercy of Mr. Tariki and his threat to close the wells, close the Suez and shut down the pipelines of the Middle East.

Petroleum is so vital to us that the threat of excessive imports should be removed by law. For this reason I expect to support action by Congress so as to provide these essential safeguards against growing dependence for ourselves and our allies on oil which, in peace, can be denied us through the capricious mischief of an emotional sheik, or, in war, could be effectively removed from use by the Soviet Union within a matter of hours.

THE IMPORTANCE AND THE INFLUENCE OF CONGRESS SINCE THE INCEPTION OF OUR GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURKE of Kentucky). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today for the purpose of discussing the work, the importance and the influence of the Congress since the inception of our Government.

These comments are inspired by and are a reflection on some books that have been written—published about this body recently. They are "An American in Washington," by Russell Baker; "History of the House of Representatives," by the Committee on House Administration, which is House Document No. 246 of the 87th Congress; and "The Wit and Wisdom of Congress" by Ed Boykin. I want to comment in some detail on Mr. Ed Boykin's book, "The Wit and Wisdom of Congress," today.

Several years ago, when Mr. Boykin wrote his enlightening and inspiring book "Congress and the Civil War," I took the floor and pointed out that this was a very fine contribution to American historical literature. In addition I suggested that the reading, studying, and seeking to understand history both as a citizen and as a legislator is more important now than ever before.

Also, at that time, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief outline of some things that I thought were highlights of this excellent book and a brief biographical sketch of this distinguished author which included the following:

Edward Boykin, whose ancestry dates back to 1678, and who has two relatives, FRANK BOYKIN and DAN FLOOD who are Members of this Congress, was born in historic Petersburg, Va. He attended Hampden-Sydney College, Virginia, and spent 3 years as a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy. After West Point, his first job was as a reporter on the famous New York Evening Journal where within 2 years he was promoted to the job of city editor.

After 6 years on the New York Journal, Mr. Boykin became impatient with the newspaper business and, though he loved it, decided to set new goals for himself. He had attracted the attention of the great inventor, Thomas A. Edison, during his editorial career and, eventually, accepted a position with Mr. Edison's company as public relations manager in charge of sales promotion. He moved up to sales manager and then director for one of the large divisions of the inventor's varied interests.

After his years with Mr. Edison's organization, Mr. Boykin joined the staff of one of the leading advertising agencies in New York where he soon was rated as a capable, successful advertising man.

His years as writer, editor, and advertising man cultivated Mr. Boykin's interest in American history. He found time, along with his many other activities, to write and have published six books on American historical subjects. At the same time he wrote two historical plays, "Lee of Virginia" and "Gentleman Unafraid." His Lee play was presented before sell-out audiences in the famous Barter Theater at Abingdon, Va. "Gentleman Unafraid" was a musical about West Point in Civil War time, written in collaboration with Oscar Hammerstein II, Jerome Kern, and Otto Harbach. Mr. Boykin's books include: Congress and the Civil War, Living Letters From American History, the Wisdom of Thomas Jefferson, the Autobiography of George Washington, First American History Quiz Book, Second American

History Quiz Book, Famous American Documents and Letters, Shrines of the Republic.

Mr. Boykin is at the moment completing two new books, one to be published in January by Rinehart & Co., New York; the other to appear in the spring and published by Funk & Wagnalls.

As a radio personality he has conducted various successful national programs based on American history. He originated and conducted for 10 years the celebrated Americana Quiz. It was through this program he earned the title "Radio Professor of American History." He also originated and conducted the successful Your Washington program based on the history of the National Capital. At the same time he acted as master of ceremonies for the National Radio Forum formerly aired on the old Blue Network.

Mr. Boykin's permanent home is at Charlottesville, Va., though he spends considerable time between Jefferson's hometown and Washington, D.C.

In 1943 Mr. Boykin was selected to head the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission in Washington and more recently to hold the directorship of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.

Since that time, he has authored and had published "The Ghost Ship of the Confederacy," which was also an excellent contribution to Civil War literature.

Now he has a book featuring an interesting and an unusual but valuable characteristic of the Congress, entitled "The Wit and Wisdom of Congress."

Before I comment further on the book itself, Mr. Speaker, I should like to further establish Mr. Boykin as a real authority on the work of the Congress.

He has read more from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD throughout history, I believe, than any other living American. This experience and his study of this field has led him to say of Congress, on one occasion:

If ever you have sat in the gallery of the Senate or House of Representatives at Washington, you may well say to yourself that you have been a spectator at the finest, the most far-reaching performance in world history. There is nothing else like it. The world has been the infinite gainer through the labors of the American Congress. Like the mills of the gods Congress grinds slowly, sometimes exasperatingly, yet out of its grinding have emerged the measures and laws by which this Nation has risen to world supremacy.

Those who have served the Congress can attest to the truth of this eloquent statement on the work of this legislative body.

On another occasion, Mr. Ed Boykin said:

Ever since the day in 1774 when the First Constitutional Congress met at Philadelphia, the proceedings of our National Legislature have been watched by the world with intense self-interest. Starting with the Declaration of Independence in 1776 the acts of the American Congress have shaped the course of world destiny . . . and freedom. Today the eyes of mankind are even more closely fixed on Capitol Hill than at any time in our history. The repercussions of what Congress says and does are today felt

almost instantly throughout the civilized and even the half-civilized world.

These, Mr. Speaker, say in a few words how this distinguished gentleman and author feels and indicates what he believes deeply about the Congress.

One time when I was visiting with him about this subject, he said to me:

If only we could somehow instill such a belief in the body politic of America.

I agree completely with the intent and the impact he wished this to have by adding:

We have a magnificent heritage, FRED. What appals me is how little the average man in the street realizes this fact.

Because I believe so sincerely that all Americans need to not only know more American history but to understand it better, I take this opportunity to call these important publications to your attention.

The book, "Wit and Wisdom of Congress," by Ed Boykin, is a treasury of anecdotes and epigrams, of quips and puns, nuggets of historic debate and gems of eloquence which have been unearthed from their entombment in the annals of Congress.

Mr. Boykin is a friend of mine and a cousin of the gentleman from Alabama by the same name. His book is a tour de force in which the author has plumbed the depths of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and its predecessors and, after much sifting and selecting, culled a delightful collection of wit and humor, puns and yarns, and amusing anecdotes. Digging out a bookful of wit and wisdom from the annals of Congress involved an immense amount of painstaking research, the results of which are most rewarding to the reader. The records of the House are full of heated debates and partisan encounters, of droll stories and delicious diatribes, and this book includes a fair sample of them all.

Whatever the subject—a mail route from Missouri to the west coast in 1829; a proposal to establish a fish hatchery at Tupelo, Miss., in 1901; a congressional investigation of immorality in current literature in 1952; or civil rights legislation in 1960—Congressmen never seem to be at a loss for words. In the course of debate, such subjects as draw poker, how to fry oysters, the mentality of Abraham Lincoln, and what Democrats and Republicans think of each other have been known to arise. Edward Boykin has undertaken the tremendous task of excavating, sifting and sorting out many examples of humor and malice, horsensense and purple oratory from the mountains of legislative verbiage. His anthology of the humor and eloquence of our forebears and colleagues down through the decades is indeed a unique achievement.

It might be well to point out what will be noted when you read the book, and everyone interested in Congress should read "The Wit and Wisdom of Congress."

A rich and varied vein of humor runs through the recorded debates of the U.S. Congress. Edward Boykin has assiduously mined that vein in this book.

One of the most striking aspects of this compilation is that it is not merely

a collection of wisecracks and witty, sometimes vitriolic, retorts. Much of the cited humor cloaks serious aspects of Congress' work, illustrating by analogous anecdote or via that peculiar American genius for hilarious exaggeration the wisdom that so often underlies apparently superficial remarks.

The following anecdote, for example, might be entitled "Parliamentary Surgery":

It may be remembered that Horace Greeley once wrote a book entitled "What I Know About Farming." Subsequently it became fashionable to perplex him with all sorts of queries about agriculture. One man wrote him inquiring the best way to cure a dog of killing sheep. Greeley promptly answered, "Cut off his tail just behind his ears." It seems to me, Mr. President, that the proper way to cure the Wilson bill which proposes to kill all the sheep in this country and rely upon other countries for wool, is to amputate this bill just below the enacting clause. (Senator Shelby M. Collum, of Illinois, 1894.)

Another anecdote illustrates Congress' faith in the basic commonsense of the American people:

In 1869, when Senator George F. Hoar was a freshman in the House, Ben Butler, of Massachusetts, was the most quarrelsome buffoon in the Lower Chamber. Observed Senator Hoar to General Nathaniel Banks one day, "Don't you think it quite likely that Butler will be the next President of the United States?"

"Never," replied Banks flatly. "Why, the papers are full of him every day," interposed Hoar. "People seem to be reading about nobody else. Wherever he goes crowds throng about him. Nobody else gets such applause, not even General Grant."

"Mr. Hoar," said Banks, "when I came down to the House this morning there was a fight between two monkeys on Pennsylvania Avenue. There was an enormous crowd, shouting, laughing, cheering. They would have paid very little attention to you and me. But when they come to elect a President of the United States they won't take either monkey."

The relationship between Congress and the President was once the subject of an apt bon mot by former Speaker of the House "Uncle" Joe Cannon:

A President without both Houses of Congress back of him doesn't amount to much more than a cat without claws in that place that burneth with fire and brimstone. (Representative Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois.)

Finally we have a detailed description of the duties of a Congressman that is only slightly exaggerated:

A Congressman has become an expanded messenger boy, an employment agency; getter-out of the Navy, Army, Marines; ward healer, wound healer, troubleshooter, law explainer, bill finder, issue translator, resolution interpreter, controversial oil-pourer, glad-hand extender, business promoter, civic ills skirmisher, veterans' affairs adjuster, ex-serviceman's champion, watchdog for the underdog, sympathizer with the underdog, namer of babies, recoverer of lost baggage, soberer of delegates; adjuster for traffic violators, voters straying into Washington and into the toils of the law, binder up of broken hearts, financial wet nurse, good samaritan, contributor to good causes—there are so many good causes—cornerstone layer, public building and bridge dedicator, ship christener. To be sure, he does get in a little flag waving and a little constitutional hoisting and spread-eagle work, but it is getting

harder every day to find time to properly study legislation—the very business we are primarily here to discharge and that must be done above all things. (Representative Luther Patrick, of Alabama, 1940.)

These few examples of comments by Congressmen that are humorous, drive home a serious point, and reflect a characteristic that is interesting, entertaining, and constructive most certainly should be read by Congressmen who are seeking to serve their constituency, their State, and their Nation in this difficult time.

Reading from these pages will help to give them perspective, understanding, and assurance as they contend with these challenges.

Therefore, I urge every Member of the Congress to have a copy on his desk for ready reference.

To those who are serious students of the Congress, the history of our country, and of the legislative processes, I recommend its reading.

To all who are interested in understanding the philosophies which we try to represent as compared with the study of other systems that legislate for the people, I urge its study.

And, to those who are responsible for providing the library shelves with worthwhile reading I recommend that you buy it and put it on the shelves where the people of your community who cannot afford to buy books may have it made available to them through the principal public and private libraries all over this country.

From this it can be seen that I am enthusiastic about this book and it is my hope that it will get wide circulation and will be widely and thoughtfully read.

I would like, in addition, to call special attention to another book. This book is written by Russell Baker and entitled "An American in Washington."

"AN AMERICAN IN WASHINGTON," BY RUSSELL BAKER, KNOPP, 1961

This book is dedicated, perhaps facetiously, to easing the tensions between the United States of America and the District of Columbia. According to the jacket, it is a guide for unwary innocents and a primer for rogues and the socially insecure, for freshman Senators and aspiring Presidents, for bureaucrats still unskilled at bamboozling the citizenry, and for their future victims.

Russell Baker, author of the book, is a member of the Washington bureau of the New York Times whose present assignment is the Senate. Of the book's ten chapters, only two deal with the Congress and they focus largely on the Senate. The book is a gentle and witty satire on Washington mores, institutions, and people—from hostesses to investigators.

In his chapter on "The Hill," the author gives a humorous description of relations between the President and Congress, the internal organization and duties of Congress, and the physical layout and facilities of the Capitol. He writes about Senate filibusters, minority rule in the Senate, and how to be a successful Senator. In a section on the "not so lower House" the author describes the differences between Senators and Representatives and portrays those "veteran

lords of the House," those "titans of the citadel," with a laudatory vignette of Representative CARL VINSON.

In the quiet of its committee rooms—

Writes Mr. Baker—

the House usually seems to do a more competent job on legislation than the Senate, where committee operations are much more loudly publicized.

And he concludes that "not only is the House, in its unobtrusive fashion, a worthy peer of the Senate but it also contains a nucleus of Members just as powerful as the Senate's most celebrated overlords."

There follows a chapter entitled "In Toga and Gumshoe" in which the author sketches the "typical pattern" of congressional investigations and offers advice to prospective witnesses on "how to be investigated."

This book does not purport to be a serious treatise on government in Washington and should not be taken seriously. It points the finger of fun at the ways of Washington and helps us to laugh at ourselves.

Also, I should like to say that the Committee on House Administration is to be congratulated for bringing out House Document No. 246 of the 87th Congress, entitled "History of the House of Representatives."

Strangely enough, nothing resembling a comprehensive history of the House had been published since nearly half a century ago. This document, prepared in the Legislative Reference Service at the committee's request, therefore fills a very real need. The author of the history is Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in American government and public administration in the service.

I am a firm, yes, a passionate believer in the study of the history of our institutions. The more we learn of the beginnings and the growth of our system of government, the more profound will be our understanding of its present nature and purposes and our vision of its future.

For me, therefore, reading this history of the House was not just a matter of satisfying my curiosity about great leaders long since departed and great events long since transpired. Rather, I was inspired, to borrow the words in the chairman's preface, to—I quote—"appreciation of the vitality and genius of our legislative institution."

The history of the House mirrors the history of the grandest and most successful venture of all time to find a satisfactory solution to the toughest of all problems—the government of mankind. The debates concerning the House in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 reveal not only the high level of the deliberations of the Founding Fathers, but also their genius for arriving at sound and politically acceptable decisions. Of almost equal interest and value is the record of the House in the First Congress, because of the many significant precedents established.

Much inspiration, and illumination, too, can be found in the evolution of the organization and procedures of the House: the House rules, its committee

system, and its leadership. Historical perspective likewise deepens one's understanding of the several aspects of the business of the House dealt with in this study: the growth of the legislative function of the House; the long history of its supervisory or oversight function with respect to executive departments and agencies; and the expanding role of the House in the area of foreign affairs.

In short, the committee has done the Members of the House and the public a genuine service by arranging for the preparation and publication of this history of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the information in this House document, along with certain additional material, is available in a book entitled "History of the House of Representatives," by George Galloway. He also was the author of "Legislative Processes in Congress." The material is substantially the same but it has certain interesting and worthwhile additions including 34 photographs of some of the mighty and great men of an earlier date as well as some of the present time.

These are accompanied by some thumbnail sketches that will be found to be both interesting and worthwhile.

Also included is a chapter on the relation between the Congress and the President.

These two books, that is House Document No. 246 of the 87th Congress, and "History of the House of Representatives," by Galloway, are fine reference books. Both treat the history of the House with a sympathetic interest.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. McVEY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), from March 12 through March 14, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CRAMER, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri, for 90 minutes, on Thursday, March 15, 1962.

Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. KEITH), for 1 hour, on March 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. ASHBROOK and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KEITH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RAINS.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. RODINO.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1023. An act to amend the act of August 20, 1954 (68 Stat. 752), in order to provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of additional features of the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3879. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the State of Wyoming for agricultural purposes certain real property in Sweetwater County, Wyo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1790. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting the 17th Report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, dated February, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 402, 80th Congress (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1791. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1792. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report setting forth the financial condition of working capital funds of the Department of Defense as of June 30, 1961, pursuant to section 405(c) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1793. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research and Development) transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more which were awarded during the period July 1 through December 31, 1961, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1794. A letter from the Assistant Chief of Naval Material (Procurement Division) Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department of the Navy's semiannual report of research and development procurement actions of \$50,000 and over for the period July 1 through December 31, 1961, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 2357; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1795. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the 48th Annual Report of the

Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the year 1961, pursuant to section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1796. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report relating to exempt reports for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1797. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report relating to certain property exempted from taxation in the District of Columbia for the calendar year 1960, pursuant to Public Law 846, 77th Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1798. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "a bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to load lines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 8, 1962, the following bills were reported on March 10, 1962:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10606. A bill to extend and improve the public assistance and child welfare services programs of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 10607. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and certain related laws to provide for the restatement of the tariff classification provisions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 12, 1962]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. S. 1991. An act relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1416). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWELL: Committee of conference. H.R. 8723. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1417). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. PFOST: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 9822. A bill to provide that lands within the exterior boundaries of a national forest acquired under section 8 of the act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Report pursuant to House Resolution 56 pertaining to ocean freight industry (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 8, 1962, the following bill was reported on March 9, 1962:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 8916. A bill to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 10645. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 so as to prohibit assistance under that act to the government of any country which is delinquent in compensating U.S. citizens for loss of any property by expropriation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 10646. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to provide that enlisted reservists called to active duty during the Berlin crisis shall be entitled to \$100 per month additional pay for duty performed pursuant to that call; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 10647. A bill to amend section 6(o) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide an exemption from induction for the sole surviving son of a family whose father died as a result of military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 10648. A bill to establish an advisory committee from the housing industry to advise the Federal Housing Commissioner with respect to the conduct and operation of the programs under his jurisdiction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 10649. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 10650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 10651. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to fees of U.S. marshals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 10652. A bill to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 10653. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance,

repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 10654. A bill to support the price of soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 10655. A bill to amend section 402 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to require approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board of certain schedules of foreign air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10656. A bill to prescribe the oath of office of justices and judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10657. A bill to amend section 1002 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to suspend certain rates relating to foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 10658. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1933, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10659. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Council to be known as the "National Citizens Council on Migratory Labor"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10660. A bill to provide grants for adult education for migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10661. A bill to provide certain payments to assist in providing improved educational opportunities for children of migrant agricultural employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10662. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to extend the child labor provisions thereof to certain children employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10663. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10664. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to further assist States in establishing and operating day-care facilities for the children of migrant agricultural workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 10665. A bill to prohibit the shipment in interstate or foreign commerce of articles imported into the United States which consist in whole or in part of products of Cuba, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCSWEEN:

H.R. 10666. A bill to limit the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 10667. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to provide grants for community facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 10668. A bill to amend the act establishing the U.S. Study Commission on the Neches, Trinity, Brazos, Colorado, Guadalupe, San Antonio, Nueces, and San Jacinto River Basins; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 10669. A bill to liberalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the assignment of national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 10670. A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Prairie Band of Pottawatomie Indians in Kansas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ARENDT:

H.J. Res. 656. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H.J. Res. 657. Joint resolution regarding Indian fishing rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the initiation of Federal studies and programs regarding the condition and exploitation of the North Pacific and Bering Sea fisheries; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the planning and construction of roads in Alaska, and urging the U.S. Congress to approve Senate Joint Resolution No. 137; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing that milk may not be sold until the fallout has been extracted in order to make it safe for consumption; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to making necessary amendments to the Federal highway law, in order to permit the erection of public telephones within the rights-of-way of the Interstate Highway System; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to supporting and enacting into legislation antirecession public works projects in depressed and distressed economic areas, and further requesting support for the bill entitled "Stand-by Capital Improvements Act of 1962"; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Sixth Legislature of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to respectfully requesting the extension to Guam of Federal financial assistance for economic development of the territory; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H.R. 10671. A bill for the relief of Klaus Dieter Jaensch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 10672. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chul Nam Lee, his wife, Hae Kyong Han, and their minor children, Myong Suk Lee, Ki Dong Lee, and Kyong Dong Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 10673. A bill for the relief of Eng (Ng) Yook Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10674. A bill for the relief of Toshi-nori Kondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 10675. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Umeno Taga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 10676. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shaoul G. S. Shashoua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 10677. A bill for the relief of the Albert Amato Electrical Contracting Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 10678. A bill for the relief of Angelo A. Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H.R. 10679. A bill for the relief of Preston H. Haskell, Jr., and Ellis Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WEIS:

H.R. 10680. A bill relating to the tax exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGER:

H.R. 10681. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Navy at the San Francisco Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

248. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Cynthia Schofield, corresponding secretary, Westfield Women's Republican Club, Westfield, N.J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting that action on the \$200 million United Nations bond issue be postponed until a careful study has been made of the administration of United Nations revenues and its budgetary system, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

249. Also, petition of Eugene D. Williams, county clerk, county of Sonoma, Santa Rosa, Calif., relative to opposing any amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would subject the income from State and local bonds to a Federal tax or cause such tax to be increased because of such bondholdings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O, Thou Eternal Spirit, whose holy purposes are beyond defeat, at the beginning of another week we come seeking Thy righteous will and craving Thine enabling strength to do it.

Thou knowest that constantly we pray "Thy kingdom come"; but we confess that often the flaming hope of that kingdom of understanding love has grown dim, as hatred and selfishness and man's inhumanity to man have desecrated the earth which could be so fair. But in